

1 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
MICHAEL A. JACOBS (Bar No. 111664)  
2 mjacobs@mofo.com  
MARC DAVID PETERS (Bar No. 211725)  
3 mdpeters@mofo.com  
DANIEL P. MUINO (Bar No. 209624)  
4 dmuino@mofo.com  
755 Page Mill Road  
5 Palo Alto, CA 94304-1018  
Telephone: (650) 813-5600 / Facsimile: (650) 494-0792

6 BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP  
7 DAVID BOIES (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)  
dboies@bsflp.com  
8 333 Main Street  
Armonk, NY 10504  
9 Telephone: (914) 749-8200 / Facsimile: (914) 749-8300  
STEVEN C. HOLTZMAN (Bar No. 144177)  
10 sholtzman@bsflp.com  
1999 Harrison St., Suite 900  
11 Oakland, CA 94612  
Telephone: (510) 874-1000 / Facsimile: (510) 874-1460

12 ORACLE CORPORATION  
13 DORIAN DALEY (Bar No. 129049)  
dorian.daley@oracle.com  
14 DEBORAH K. MILLER (Bar No. 95527)  
deborah.miller@oracle.com  
15 MATTHEW M. SARBORARIA (Bar No. 211600)  
matthew.sarboraria@oracle.com  
16 500 Oracle Parkway  
Redwood City, CA 94065  
17 Telephone: (650) 506-5200 / Facsimile: (650) 506-7114

18 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
ORACLE AMERICA, INC.

20 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
21 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
22 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

23 ORACLE AMERICA, INC.  
24 Plaintiff,  
25 v.  
26 GOOGLE INC.  
27 Defendant.

Case No. CV 10-03561 WHA

**ORACLE'S CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT**

Date: October 19, 2011  
Time: 9:30 a.m.  
Dept.: Courtroom 9, 19th Floor  
Judge: Honorable William H. Alsup

1 The Court's order of October 12, 2011, directed the parties to be prepared to address three  
2 issues at the case management conference on October 19, 2011:

3 (1) How much time the Rule 706 expert will require to complete his work, including the  
4 time needed to complete an independent damages study as opposed to only critiquing the studies  
5 provided by the parties' damages experts.

6 (2) The possibility of severing the copyright claim from the patent claims and first  
7 conducting a shorter trial on the copyright claim.

8 (3) The possibility of general postponement and how best to use any intervening time, for  
9 example with respect to motion practice.

10 Oracle briefly addresses each of these points below.

11 **1. Time Required by Rule 706 Expert**

12 Oracle assumes that this first question is addressed to counsel for Dr. Kearl.

13 **2. Oracle's Copyright Claim Should Be Tried With The Patent Claims**

14 Oracle is opposed to severing the copyright claim from the patent claims and trying it  
15 separately. The copyright and patent claims should be tried together for at least two reasons:

16 *First*, the copyright and patent claims significantly overlap, and trying the claims  
17 separately would result in great redundancy in trial presentation. Nearly every witness on  
18 Oracle's list possesses information relevant to both the copyright and patent claims. For example:  
19 testimony regarding (1) the background of the Java platform, its development, and innovative  
20 features (Mark Reinhold, James Gosling, Guy Steele); (2) the development of Android, including  
21 the code and features copied from Java (Andy Rubin, Joshua Bloch, Bob Lee, Daniel Bornstein,  
22 Andy McFadden, Brian Swetland); (3) Google's direct infringement of Oracle's copyrights and  
23 patents through its use of Android devices for testing and other purposes (Dan Morrill, Patrick  
24 Brady); (4) Google's willful infringement of Oracle's intellectual property rights, the evidence of  
25 which will be much the same for copyrights and patents (Tim Lindholm, Andy Rubin, Joshua  
26 Bloch, Bob Lee, Brian Swetland); (5) the licensing negotiations between Google and Sun/Oracle  
27 for rights to use the copyrighted and patented features of Java in Android (Vineet Gupta, Param  
28 Singh, Larry Ellison, Thomas Kurian, Larry Page, Eric Schmidt, Andy Rubin); and (6) the harm

1 caused by Android to Java (Larry Ellison, Jeet Kaul, Thomas Kurian, Hasan Rizvi, Edward  
2 Screven).

3 As it will not be possible to isolate the copyright and patent-related testimony of these  
4 witnesses, trying the claims separately will result in the witnesses testifying twice on the same  
5 subjects, greatly lengthening the necessary trial time. Similarly, the documentary evidence on  
6 these subjects (including e-mails and presentations reflecting Android's development, Google's  
7 willful infringement, and the licensing negotiations) will substantially overlap, requiring the jury  
8 to view them twice.

9 **Second**, separating Oracle's copyright and patent claims would prejudice Oracle's case on  
10 both sets of claims, as Google's copyright infringement is inextricably intertwined with its  
11 infringement of Oracle's patents. Google chose to incorporate Java virtual machine technology  
12 into Android, allowing Android to run applications written in Java with the speed and memory  
13 efficiency of a Java virtual machine. In doing so, Google also chose to copy the core Java API  
14 specifications and class libraries which platform vendors must license in order to support Java  
15 applications, and to incorporate the patented virtual machine features into Android's Dalvik  
16 virtual machine and related software components. The story of this infringement is not divisible.  
17 The copying of the core Java API specifications and the inclusion of the patented features in  
18 Android were carried out by the same team of Google engineers and done for the same reason –  
19 to provide Android with the advantages of Java, including speed, efficiency, and a wide  
20 community of developers. For the '476 patent in particular, the conduct that led to infringement  
21 of that patent (Google's inclusion of the java.security API packages in Android) is the same  
22 activity that infringes Oracle's copyrights in those packages. For the jury to fully appreciate the  
23 scope of Google's willful copyright infringement, it must be permitted to consider the  
24 overlapping evidence of willful patent infringement.

25 Additionally, if the copyright and patent claims are tried to different juries, there is  
26 significant risk that the second jury would be required to re-examine a factual issue determined by  
27 the first, in violation of the Seventh Amendment's Re-examination Clause. *See, e.g., Gasoline*  
28 *Products Co. v. Champlin Refining Co.*, 283 U.S. 494, 500-01 (1931) (under Re-examination

1 Clause, reversing judgment where successive juries might have been required to decide same  
2 facts); *United Airlines, Inc. v. Weiner*, 286 F.2d 302, 306 (9th Cir. 1961) (reversing where  
3 successive juries were used and issues of liability and damages were “so interwoven” that “the  
4 former cannot be submitted to the jury independently of the latter”). On willfulness, indirect  
5 patent infringement, and contributory copyright infringement, for instance, each jury would  
6 consider much of the same evidence in deciding whether Google’s conduct was knowing and  
7 willful. If the claims were tried separately to separate juries, the second jury would almost  
8 inevitably revisit facts decided by the first. Even if a single jury were used, the parties will adjust  
9 their presentations the second time around, with the prospect that a single jury would return  
10 inconsistent verdicts.

11 Even if that risk could be avoided, holding separate trials on Oracle’s copyright and patent  
12 claims would *lengthen* the overall trial of this case, not shorten it, and would severely prejudice  
13 Oracle’s ability to fairly present the intertwined facts of this case for adjudication. For these  
14 reasons, Oracle’s copyright and patent claims should be tried together.

### 15 **3. General Postponement and Motion Practice**

16 In the event that the trial is postponed, Oracle proposes to file two motions for summary  
17 judgment to narrow the issues in the case for trial.

18 First, Oracle proposes to file a motion for summary judgment of the copyrightability of  
19 the selection and arrangement of names in the 37 API design specifications at issue. In its  
20 summary judgment order, the Court left open this question, stating that

21 In finding that the names of the various items appearing in the disputed API  
22 package specifications are not protected by copyright, this order does not foreclose  
23 the possibility that the selection or arrangement of those names is subject to  
24 copyright protection. *See Lamps Plus, Inc. v. Seattle Lighting Fixture Co.*, 345  
25 F.3d 1140, 1147 (9th Cir. 2003) (“[A] combination of *unprotectable* elements is  
eligible for copyright protection only if those elements are numerous enough and  
their selection and arrangement original enough that their combination constitutes  
an original work of authorship.”)

26 (ECF No. 433, Order Partially Granting and Partially Denying Defendant’s Motion for Summary  
27 Judgment on Copyright Claim, at 8 (emphasis supplied in order).)

1 Under copyright law, there is a “minimal amount of creativity required to satisfy the low  
2 threshold for demonstrating originality,” and when appropriate, originality may be determined by  
3 the Court on summary judgment. *See Jacobs v. Katzer*, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 115204, at \*9-10  
4 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 10, 2009) (granting summary judgment of originality and copyrightability of  
5 plaintiff’s selection and arrangement of “Decoder Definition Text Files” reflecting decoder  
6 information from model railroad manufacturers). The selection and arrangement of the nearly  
7 8000 names found in the APIs readily surpasses this standard and originality can be determined as  
8 a matter of law.

9 Second, Oracle proposes to file a motion for summary judgment on Google’s four  
10 equitable defenses – laches, equitable estoppel, implied license and waiver. The parties agree that  
11 these four equitable defenses are for the Court to decide. (ECF No. 525, Parties’ Joint Proposed  
12 Pretrial Order, at 9-10, 12). Moreover, all four defenses arise out of the same general set of facts  
13 – Google’s allegations concerning statements and actions, or inaction, by Sun and Oracle relating  
14 to the enforcement of the patents and copyrights at issue – Google has in fact grouped laches,  
15 estoppel and waiver under the same heading in its affirmative defenses. (*See* ECF No. 51,  
16 Google Inc’s Answer to Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint for Patent and Copyright Infringement  
17 and Amended Counterclaims, at 10, 12-13 (Third, Eleventh and Eighteenth Defenses). Oracle  
18 believes these defenses can be decided against Google as a matter of law as well.

19  
20  
21 Dated: October 18, 2011

MICHAEL A. JACOBS  
MARC DAVID PETERS  
DANIEL P. MUINO  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

22  
23  
24 By: /s/ Michael A. Jacobs

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
ORACLE AMERICA, INC.